Smith's Report

No. 180 *Challenging the Holocaust Taboo Since 1990* March 2011

FROM LADY GAGA TO SAIGON AND BACK AGAIN

by Bradley Smith for YouTube

These are the notes for my YouTube video uploaded onto the Internet on 08 February. Today I'm reminded of a Jackie Gleason sketch I saw only last night on the television from 1957. And I know—glamour photos are not usually associated with serious revisionist work. How-ever. . . .

Last night on the television I came across a clip of Lady Gaga doing something on a stage in a costume where she was pretty much naked. I've noted once before that I used to think Lady Gaga was a transvestite, it was all the odd stories about her, but that I had found I was mistaken. Last night I was particularly struck by the quality of her thighs. Beautiful. Anyhow, she had stopped her performance now and was telling her audience to reach for the stars, that only a few years ago she was sitting in audiences like the present one watching the star perform on stage. Now, she meant to say, look where she is.

My brain, being the way it is, thought about "fragments." What was that? I recalled that I had recently used the expression "fragments" to refer to the gas chamber story being a fragment of WWII history. Now I saw that each person watching Lady Gaga was one fragment of her audience. In that moment I was one of those fragments. Then the brain left the bed

room here and I saw myself in the cafeteria at the VA Hospital in La Jolla, north of San Diego, where I was this past Monday. I was sitting alone at a table with a coffee and a little yogurt.

The room was filled with dozens of old, sick, half-sick guys eating breakfast. We were living out our normal, fragmented lives. I thought about how my own fragmented life is focused on work, on money, on health. One day one fragment dominates the life, the next a different one. That morning it was all money. I was worried about the money. Again. Very worried.

That morning I would do some blood work, keep an appointment with my oncologist who is tracking the cancer, and after that there was the surgeon who would cut the port out of my chest. It would have been normal for the brain to be focused on the health fragment of the life, but no, it was focused on the money. The anxiety about the money. I didn't have enough to do the work right. To take care of the family, the grandkids.

The money fragment of my life had cancelled out the fragments of work and health. I'm not good with the money. I'm not careless with it. I'm very careful about how I budget

contributions. But every few months, every few weeks, I am suddenly without any. And then there's the anxiety.

The problem is that in some very deep way I am just not interested in the money. There's something missing in me. I don't know what it is or how to fix it. It can be very dangerous when you're not interested in money the way I am not interested in it. There are a number of stories I could tell you to illustrate this. I will tell you the briefest outline of one story that illustrates what I'm talking about. I can't tell the complete story here. Only a few highlights to make my curious point.

Okay.

In 1968 I shipped out from Wilmington, California, on a tramp steamer headed for Vietnam. The idea was to jump ship in Vung-Tau at the mouth of the Saigon River, make my way to Saigon, get press credentials, and write a book about how it was to be there from my particular point of view, after which I would become rich and famous.

After some 20 days on the water we were in the South China Sea when the North Vietnamese launched its *Tet* offensive. Our ship was rerouted to Satta Heep in Thailand. This complicated my plan. Nevertheless, with a couple hundred dollar advance I jumped ship in Satta Heep and made my way to Bangkok intending to fly to Saigon. The Thais would not allow me to fly out of Thailand because without a visa I was not in Thailand. It was suggested I go to the downtown police station and see what could be done.

I had already learned that folk lived like chickens in the downtown jail. I thought about it. I caught a bus and made my way to the border with Laos, got across the Mekong river one night at two in the morning, got a Laotian visa—it was common knowledge that the Laotians gave visas to anyone who showed up—and returned to Bangkok. All told I was in Bangkok four weeks. Some interesting stories.

But remember, I'm talking about the money here. How I have a lack of interest in money that can be very dangerous. So, with the Laotian visa, I was able to fly out of

Sara J. Bloomfield & Elie Wiesel
Is it love or business?

Bangkok to Saigon. That afternoon when I landed in Tan Son Nhat airport Saigon itself was still invested with Viet Cong and North Vietnamese.

I was alone. I did not know one person in Saigon. Not one anywhere in Vietnam. I remember walking south out of the airport onto a two lane road toward the city, carrying a suitcase in one hand, my typewriter in the other. I had six dollars in my pocket.

Walking along, sticking out my thumb when a car or truck passed, I felt just fine. I was there. The war was still happening. I had my typewriter. I was where I wanted to be. Six dollars in the pocket.

I think this illustrates rather well what I mean when I say it's very dangerous to be not interested in the money the way I am not interested in it. Which is the way I am now, inexplicably, indefensibly disinterested in the money. Until I don't have any. Then it dominates my time, my hours.

Ironically, a story about Sara J. Bloomfield has just come across my desk. Sara is the director of the USHMM. I reported last fall on how she directed a fund-raising campaign for her museum by exploiting a seven-word text link I ran online in the student newspaper, the *Daily Badger*, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The ad read: "The Holocaust Question: The Power of Taboo." Seven words. The whole *enchilada*. Forgive my Spanish. Sara wrote that my work is: "Deplorable. Hate-filled. Designed to manipulate young minds. Offensive and dangerous."

And then she added: "Today, I ask you to take a stand against those who spread such venom by making a $75 gift to help us combat denial by preserving and presenting the truth."

Sara, working for an Institution substantially funded by the U.S. Congress, is salaried at $542,654 a year, that is—$10,400 a week. Every week $10,400. Last week contributions to Bradley R. Smith, dba CODOH, amounted to $685.

Smith $685. Sara $10,400. I have to admire the lady. I would do what Sara does if only I could. It's just not in my genes. I've worked for 25 years to encourage intellectual freedom with regard to the

Continued on page 12

Inchwise Revisionism

by Jett Rucker

When a besieging army seeks to take an impregnable fort or castle, often it undertakes an incremental approach, one of which any given day's (or week's) progress may be indiscernible, at least to the defenders, or even to the attackers, except for the fact that they're dog-tired from working all day (and night), day after day (and night after night).

Perhaps the ultimate such measure is that of blockade—cutting off food and resupply can reduce the most formidable keep ever erected. But that, to cut through the analogy, does not apply to those defending the impregnable Holocaust Myth. Quite the contrary—it is they who command the inexhaustible supplies of money and firepower, and we who would defy them who live unarmed, always hand-to-mouth, ever on the brink of starvation, or the need to attend to our perpetually meager wherewithals.

But we command the initiative, and have for decades at this point, and we command, almost by default, the fiery energy that comes paradoxically from that very hunger from which we constantly suffer. So, an active strategy, rather than the more passive one referred to in the above the analogy, suits our situation, and many such strategies beckon to us, all with the capacity to absorb all our resources of energy and ingenuity, but only a few with the capacity to afford our cause any potential at all for progress as time continues its inexorable wearing on both sides of the contest we've joined.

The strategy I should like here to illuminate, then, is one at contriving which I have been working for some time, but, since I have been at this for less than a hundred years, from which as yet I have little progress to show, or can even detect with my own eyes. But even if my memory could encompass a

> ***What could all this have to do with the revision of historical orthodoxies that not only falsely empower a rapacious, imperialistic fox in the henhouse of nations, but that maligns and oppresses others among the world's polities continually struggling to coexist at least peacefully, if not prosperously, among its sovereign fellows?***

hundred years of revisionism (it clearly cannot, not of revisionism nor of anything else), it might still disclose the stubborn failure of those massive ramparts yet to crumble. The analogy above beckons me back.

Approaching the high walls of a castle under a constant hail of arrows, Greek fire, and God-knows-what-else entails a process more difficult, and above all, slower, than just walking (or even crawling) up to the gate and pushing it open. The process is usually one known as "siege trenches," in which successive rings of trenches parallel to the besieged walls are dug (oof!) closer and closer to the walls, until the next (slow, difficult) process can begin, which is called "sapping." Sapping entails digging straight toward the defending walls from the forwardmost trench *entirely underground*, with the aim, upon reaching the foundations, of either undermining the wall so that it collapses, or emplacing explosives under the wall to effect the same thing more decisively.

The key offensive attributes of these laborious and, yes, slow and dangerous methods are: (a) the defender cannot effectively oppose the measures without shifting to the offensive, which involves, among other things, opening his gates to launch sorties; and (b) the enemy cannot even see *where* or *when* the final (sapping) phase has been launched, and so cannot bring his overwhelming forces to bear at the point/s required for opposing them.

What could all this have to do with the revision of historical orthodoxies that not only falsely empower a rapacious, imperialistic fox in the henhouse of nations, but that maligns and oppresses others among the world's polities continually struggling to coexist at least peacefully, if not prosperously, among its sovereign fellows? The answer, as I see it, is plenty.

This parable is illustrated in the arena known to all of us as Wikipedia, the "encyclopedia" in which

each of us (you . . . me . . . and *them*) has the capability not only to submit our own understandings of things, but also (and this is the important part) to obliterate the understandings that may previously have been submitted by others, who might see things differently from the way we see them. Continuing with the parable, one can try marching up to the gate and pushing on it, gently or hard as befits one's means, provided one has withstood all the slings and arrows aimed at keeping one back from the gate.

Suppose, for example, that you read, in Rudolf Höss's (the commandant of Auschwitz) "confession," that *Aktion Reinhardt* was, instead of the fiendish plan to establish a number of concentration camps dedicated to the murder of Jews, merely an administrative program aimed at capturing for the Reich treasury all the personal valuables of people deported from their homes to labor camps in the underdeveloped eastern territories recently occupied by the Wehrmacht early in the Second World War. Suppose, further, that you developed the considerable skills involved in editing the Wikipedia article on the Holocaust where it described *Aktion Reinhardt* and submitted alternatively (without modifying, much less removing, the erroneous "mainstream" version) that Höss said it was only named after Finance Undersecretary Fritz Reinhardt and had a largely fiscal purpose.

Do you imagine that a "frontal assault" of this kind would be allowed to stand? Well, if so, then you are hopelessly naïve as to the forces engaged in this contest, their tactics, and their respective strengths! The edit of which I speak was what Wikipedians (defenders, most of them, of mainstream "wisdom") call "speedily" deleted, and further beaten into the ground with the condemnation that such a view was an invention of the anti-Semitic Holocaust deniers, having only the purpose of advancing their Nazi-inspired agenda, and bearing no relation to the truth despite their (the Wikipedians') acceptance of

One example of a hauberk

the rest of Höss's incredible confessions about gassing and incinerating untold millions of Jews as soon as they arrived at his camp. In other words, *some* things may be believed, and other things may not be.

So, his hauberk, his shirt of mail armor, bristling with arrows and his brow bleeding from a thousand cuts and bruises, our would-be champion of the truth slinks chastened back to the besieging lines from which he foolishly ventured forward after reading Höss's memoirs. Clearly, this Holocaust-defending fortress is *not* one to be trifled with.

Months later, with the wounds from his intemperate affray almost healed, our dauntless would-be Wikipedia editor reads Thomas Crowell's wonderful *The Gas Chamber of Sherlock Holmes*, in which the author explains that the gastight doors and shutters found at various places in a number of wartime labor camps run by the Germans were not for purposes of killing people with poison gas introduced from the ground, but for the purpose of *protecting* people (yes, even hardworking, highly trained inmates) from poison gas that they had good reason to fear would be dropped from enemy bombers. Crowell even asserted that arrangements of this kind were standard in the designs of air-raid shelters throughout Germany as it undertook as best it could to defend its populace from an unprecedented airborne genocide.

Our hero's wounds did heal, but are not forgotten as again he girds himself for battle on the blood-soaked fields of Wikipedia. What does he do this time? He digs a trench—that's what he does. He happens to be in possession of documentation of the design of an air-raid shelter in Hamburg erected by the Germans in 1942. This design shows "gas-protection chambers" (*Gasschutzanlage*) in major portions of its space. So—insidiously one might even say—he creeps unnoticed into a Wikipedia article that concerns the air-raid shelter in Hamburg. An article that happens not to mention that the shelter incorporated areas intended to protect the occupants against poison-gas bombs. And, fearlessly citing the (published) designs in his possession, he modifies the article to explain that the shelter incorporated areas intended to protect the inhabitants from poison-gas bombings.

The entry survives to the time of this writing (but perhaps no longer than it takes the other side to read this article). What does it do? In its tiny way, it undergirds the assertion of Thomas Crowell that German air-raid-shelter design incorporated protection against poison-gas bombs. It's little more than a shovelful of the dirt that lies between our trench and the foundations of the enemy's towering walls.

But it is a shovelful, and it goes in the right direction. The work is hard, and slow, and unpleasant. By its nature, it is invisible, as it must be—sappers *never* get credit for the final victory, even though our work was indispensable to its attainment. The glory goes to those who raise the enemies' severed heads high for the raucous cheer of the victors.

But we (sappers) do want victory, don't we? So, if you should not be, one way or the other, the wielder of a bloodied sword . . . find a shovel. Pick it up.

See where the enemy's foundations lie. Dig in that direction. And take your time. Victory will be ours.

Life Sign

by Germar Rudolf

Somewhere in Mexico, Feb. 21, 2011

Dear friends, dear supporters:

Ever since I left England end of August last year, I've basically kept radio silence, for which I ask for understanding and forgiveness. I owe you my gratitude for your continued moral and in a few cases also generous financial support, which are very important to me.

Please permit me to tell you about my latest odyssey, which might make it understandable why contact has been severed for the past six months.

On August 31 I travelled to Latin America hoping that my application for permanent legal residence in the US ("green card"), which I had filed in late 2009, would soon be adjudicated positively, so that I could join my wife and daughter in the U.S.

As a reminder: When I was arrested and deported from the U.S. in November 2005, I was banned to return to the U.S. for five years. My motion to have this ban lifted early, which I had filed in the summer of 2009, has not been decided to this day. Although my application for a "green card" was processed by the U.S. Consulate in Frankfurt, Germany, in April 2010, it was not finally adjudicated due to the still pending ban. I was told to get in touch with the consulate after the ban had either been lifted or expired. Since the ban expired in mid November 2010, I traveled to northwest Mexico in expectation of a decision.

On getting in touch, the consulate informed us on Nov. 15, 2010, that they would need five workdays to finally adjudicate my application, after which they would get in touch.

Since we still hadn't heard anything after eight workdays, we inquired again. In early December 2010 we were told that there had been a delay due to a change of staff. They apologized and promised to wrap up the case within the next 14 days at the latest.

After two more weeks we again had heard nothing from the consulate. Repeated inquires remained unanswered. As a result, Christmas for the Rudolf family fell through. I spent it separated from my family in Mexico...

End of December 2010 the consulate finally got back to us and apologized once more for the long delay, yet explained this time that the case was so complicated that they could not even give an estimate as to how long it will take to adjudicate it. A formal inquiry filed shortly afterwards about the state of affairs revealed in early February that my application is no longer dealt with by the consulate in Frankfurt, but that it is now in Washington, where it is subjected to lengthy security screenings.

Considering that I have been an open book to the U.S. authorities ever since my asylum case was in-

itiated in 2000, nothing justifies this lengthy "security screening." After careful consideration and intensive consultation we therefore decided to go back to court. On January 31, 2011, we filed a "Writ of Mandamus" against the U.S. government, asking a Federal Court to force the government to render a decision. The government has 60 days to respond to this suit, after which the court will either dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction or will decide it rather quickly (assuming that water doesn't flow uphill...). By the end of April/early May we hope to know more about our future. However, all the court can do is force the U.S. government to decide somehow. In case this happens, we now expect them to turn down my application for some bogus reason.

Since my Mexican tourist visa waiver will expire end of February, I have to leave the country. I will temporarily live with friends in Central America. Should there be no silver lining at the horizon by the end of April/early May, I will return to Europe. Since I am prohibited to be a spouse to my wife and a father to my daughter, I will at least be a father to the children from my first marriage by temporarily returning to Germany.

Meanwhile my wife prepares herself morally to leave the U.S. permanently this coming summer. She can no longer bear the stress of a career, of raising our daughter as a single mother and of running a household without any support. We will probably settle permanently in England, provided that my wife obtains a permission to immigrate. For this I have to prove according to British law that I am capable of supporting my family—which I cannot do currently, as I am formally seen as homeless and jobless.

Marital and family bliss are apparently meant only for rich people in England... I've been out of prison for more than one and a half year now , but I am still separated from wife and child, with no end in sight. It feels like I am still a prisoner. (Not to mention that my lawyer bill for January alone amounted to 7,701 US dollars straight.) You can imagine how I feel.

Since I will probably be traveling during the next three months, email is the only realistic way of contacting me. If you want to support my family and me financially, you can find details below about how this can be done.

With kind regards

Germar Rudolf

Public Email, further dissemination permitted

Subject: Freedom of Expression at University of Oregon

By Jimmy Marr

Pacifica Forum's founder, Professor Emeritus Orval Etter, has been an advocate of free speech at the University of Oregon for over seventy-five years. His earliest memory of controversial speaking engagements at U.O. occurred in the fall of 1934 when Norman Thomas of the Socialist Party of America delivered a speech in Gerlinger Hall. Even though socialism was an unsavory topic for many Americans at that time, Mr. Etter recalls a respectful hearing of Mr. Thomas' views. In the 1960's Mr. Etter remembers the university's gracious reception of convicted felon Gus Hall, who had recently been released from federal prison for advocating the violent overthrow of the United States government.

Mr. Etter holds these memories in stark contrast to the censorial reaction of the University to his recent efforts to offer a podium to speakers expressing dissident views on the Holocaust. In January of 2010, Pacifica Forum attempted to host a series of presentations consisting largely of screenings and discussions of video segments from holocaustdenialvideos.com.

These programs (or attempted programs) were met with an array of censorial strategies under the

auspices of public safety. The long-standing policy of granting a fixed location for Pacifica Forum's weekly meetings on a quarterly basis was changed to a system of last-minute week-to-week notifications. Many meetings were cancelled outright. The locations for approved meetings were unpredictable, leaving very little lead for publicizing locations. Time allotted for meetings was reduced from 90 minutes to 1 hour, with almost no time allowed for audiences to enter and exit the building. The speaker's podium was separated from the audience by crime-scene tape.

Informed only by word-of-mouth, a small core of dedicated supporters continued following the presentations. Detractors engaged

Orval Etter

in a wide range of disruptive tactics which were largely ignored by campus security officials until late spring when four agitators were arrested for throwing stink-bombs.

During the summer term, the University's faculty senate quietly passed a resolution changing the long-standing policy of facility usage by emeritus faculty to require departmental approval by majority vote of tenure-track professors on a lecture-by-lecture basis. When the new academic year kicked off, no such approval was forthcoming, and at the age of 96, Orval Etter's 76-year tradition of celebrating freedom of expression at the University of Oregon passed unnoticed into obscurity.

[

New “Memorial Center” Planned for the Sobibór “Death Camp”

By Thomas Kues

Some five months ago, on 17 August 2010, the Zionist news site YNet published the following item:

"Israel will continue to support efforts to set up a memorial center at Sobibor, according to an agreement reached by the director general of the Ministry of Information and Diaspora Affairs Ronen Plot and the Chairman of the Yad Vashem Directorate Avner Shalev, with Dr. Andzrej Konrat, who is in charge of Holocaust remembrance in Poland.

"The agreement is in keeping with the statement of intentions agreed upon in 2008 by Israel, Poland, Slovakia and the Netherlands.

"Almost nothing remained of the Sobibor Nazi death camp in Poland at the end of the war. The creation of a memorial center is the result of cooperative research by Poland’s council for the memory of war victims, headed by Minister Konrat, and Israel’s Ministry of Information and Diaspora Affairs and Foreign Ministry, directed by Yad Vashem researchers and assisted by Slovakia and the Netherlands.

"For this purpose, an international committee of experts was established, and digs were carried out at the site to determine the precise location of the gas chambers.

"The memorial center project, estimated to cost some 6 million euros ($8 million), is currently in its first planning stages. Decisions about an international competition for planning the building and decisions on budget allocation will be made in a joint meeting next month in Warsaw, in which all participating countries will be present. The center is due to be completed by October 2013, the 70th anniversary of the prisoners’ uprising at the camp.

"‘We see this as a sacred joint obligation to remember the past and the victims,’ said Konrat

during the meeting.

"'I welcome Polish cooperation and the importance the minister gives to remembering the Holocaust,' the director-general of the Ministry of Information said. 'The establishment of a center at the death camp in which some 250,000 Jews were killed is an important part in education… and a part of the struggle against all those who would deny it happened.'"

The above news notice is a sure sign that the guardians of the orthodox holocaust story feel a growing desperation confronted with the mass of revisionist criticism of the gas-chamber mythos, and that accordingly they are resorting to certain underhanded strategies in order to prevent further research at the former sites of the "pure extermination camps" of Belzec, Sobibór and Treblinka (collectively known as the Reinhardt camps), research which could only cause further damage to the orthodox historiography.

In the case of Treblinka, most of the former camp site was covered with slabs of concrete and large stones already in the 1960s. In Belzec, where an archeological survey was carried out in the late 1990s (with devastating results for the official historical picture of this "death camp," cf. Carlo Mattogno, *Belzec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research, and History*, Theses & Dissertations Press 2004, pp. 71-96), the whole of the former campsite was covered in the early 2000s with an enormous concrete "monument". It would not be exactly surprising if Sobibór is now headed for a similar fate, although thus far there has been no news on the progress of the installation of the new memorial (the website of the Sobibór memorial/museum, www.sobibor.edu.pl, also appears to be down).

The YNet item contains two passages of particular note. First, the Israeli minister Ronen Plot is quoted as speaking of 250,000 Sobibór victims. Even though this figure may well still be used by encyclopedias, guidebooks and the like, it has in fact been untenable since the discovery of the so-called Höfle document in 2000. This document shows that 101,370 Jews were *deported* to Sobibór up until the end of 1942. The camp was in use until October 1943, but all sources agree that the number of Jews deported to Sobibór during 1943 was much smaller than that of 1942. Thus the leading exterminationist expert on Sobibór, Jules Schelvis, nowadays states the victim figure as approximately 170,000.

Also in "Object E" were discovered numerous remains of clothing and toilet articles, such as hairclips, perfume bottles, belts etc. The supposed gas chamber victims on the other hand are alleged to have entered the chambers of death already naked.

Secondly, we read in the article that an "international committee of experts" has carried out a survey at the former camp site in order to "determine the precise location of the gas chambers." In fact not one but two archeological surveys have been carried out for this purpose. The first documented survey took place in 2000-2001 and was headed by the Polish archeology professor Andrzej Kola (who also led the abovementioned survey at Belzec); the second one in 2007-2008 was conducted by the Israeli-Polish trio Isaac Gilead, Yoram Haimi and Wojciech Mazurek. There is also a mysterious third excavation: holocaust historian Martin Gilbert in a travel journal reveals that archeological digs for the cremation pyres reported by eyewitnesses were carried out in 1996 (*Holocaust Journey*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1997, p. 250). Nothing has ever been published on this survey, which no doubt would be completely unknown if it wasn't for Gilbert's itinerary coincidentally taking him to the site at the right time.

Andrzej Kola surveyed the whole of "Lager III"—the fenced-off section of the camp wherein the alleged gas chamber building supposedly was located and which covers less than 4 hectares—with probe drillings and subsequently carried out archeological digs at five identified building remains. Of these, "Object E" was identified in the south-west corner of Lager III, exactly where the gas chamber building was located according to maps drawn by the eyewitnesses. The problem with this discovery is that "Object E" in no way corresponds to the witness descriptions of the building. The six gas chambers in the camp were allegedly arranged three and three alongside a central corridor inside a *brick or concrete building* measuring approximately 10 x 13-18 meters.

"Object E" on the other hand consists of two barracks built *completely out of wood*, the smaller one measuring 14 x 4 m, the larger one no less than 60-80 x 6 m! Remarkably enough, not a single eyewitness has spoken of this

enormous wooden barrack, the dimensions of which as well as construction material makes it impossible to identify with the alleged gas chamber building (the same naturally goes for the smaller barrack). Also in "Object E" were discovered numerous remains of clothing and toilet articles, such as hairclips, perfume bottles, belts etc. The supposed gas chamber victims on the other hand are alleged to have entered the chambers of death already naked.

These finds made Kola dismiss in his excavation report the hypothesis that "Object E" could have served as the gas chamber building. Instead, he proposed the hypothesis—which has no support in eyewitness testimony—that the larger barrack served as a magazine for the confiscated clothing and belongings of the gas chamber victims (cf. J. Graf, T. Kues, C. Mattogno, *Sobibór: Holocaust Propaganda and Reality*, TBR Books 2010, pp. 157-162).

None of the four other building remains identified by Kola in the former Lager III were even close to fitting the descriptions of the searched-for gas-chamber building. Another remarkable find, however, was "Object A," a small building with a cellar in which were found remains from an oven and coal storage. Kola somewhat halfheartedly interprets this as the remains of a blacksmith's workshop, despite the fact that there already existed a blacksmith in another part of the camp, and a small camp such as Sobibór would hardly need two blacksmiths. Besides, what would the use be of a blacksmith's workshop in a camp section supposedly devoted only to the gassing, burial and cremation of the alleged victims (cf. ibid., pp. 153-155)? In our study of Sobibór Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno and I have interpreted "Object A" as an installation in which clothing and other items were deloused using heated air or steam (produced by the oven), and "Object E" as a delousing barrack in which the Jews deported to the camp were showered and deloused before being sent further east to the German-occupied part of the Soviet Union (ibid., pp. 286-287).

In the total absence of evidence supporting the Sobibór mass gassing allegations, the guardians of the extermination camp legend such as Avner Shalev and Andrzej Konrat have no other option than to resort to obfuscation of facts and prevention of further research, all disguised as "commemoration."

The archeological survey carried out at Sobibór 2007-2008 by the trio Gilead-Haimi-Mazurek has been published only with extreme brevity in an article published last year in the American journal *Present Pasts* ("Excavating Nazi Extermination Centres", Vol. I, 2009). In this article we read that the three archeologists "acting on the assumption" that they "knew roughly where the gas chamber was located (…) decided to dig first in the area bordering the west wall of Kola's Building E." In this area, however, one found no building remains whatsoever (ibid., p. 27). Later, in summer 2008, the team was reinforced by American geophysicists equipped with, among other things, ground-penetrating radar. Despite the aid of advanced technology and the fact that Lager III had already been mapped out by Kola, they failed miserably with detecting any remains of the fabled gas chambers, and in the 2009 article one had to grudgingly admit that "[i]t is obvious that the location of the gas chambers is a complex issue that has to be solved, an important objective for future archaeological research at Sobibór" (ibid., p. 33f).

In other word: the "international committee of experts" spoken about in the YNet news notice has *not found any trace* of the alleged homicidal gas chambers of Sobibór, despite two surveys and a very limited area to search through. The explanation for this is of course simple: the alleged gas chambers never existed in the first place, and could therefore not leave any remains.

In our study, Mattogno, Graf and I have presented a wide assortment of evidence which unequivocally shows that Sobibór in fact was a transit camp—as it was designated in a classified internal communication between the SS leader Heinrich Himmler and the SS camp administrator Oswald Pohl in the summer of 1943 (Nuremberg document NO-482)—in which deported Jews were deloused and then sent on eastwards, for example to Lithuania (J. Graf, T. Kues, C. Mattogno, *Sobibór...,* see especially chapters 9 and 10).

In the total absence of evidence supporting the Sobibór mass gassing allegations, the guardians of the extermination camp legend such as Avner Shalev and Andrzej Konrat have no other option than to resort to obfuscation of facts and prevention of further research, all

disguised as “commemoration.”

Meanwhile, in Munich, the trial against John Demjanjuk for his alleged assistance in the murder of 27,900 Jews at Sobibór continues. Fifteen months have now passed since it commenced on 30 November 2009. The progress of the trial has repeatedly been delayed due to the defendant's steadily worsening health. Indeed, it is possible that Demjanjuk, who will turn 91 on 3 April this year, will not live to see the end of it. On 21 February the German Press Agency (DPA) reported that the trial had now entered its final phase and that a verdict is expected on 23 March this year, but it would not be surprising if this date were postponed.

The people staging this grotesque farce seem determined to go on persecuting this dying nonagenarian, no matter what. Media attention on the case appears to be gradually waning, though, despite it probably being the last major "Nazi war crimes trial." Samuel Kunz, a former Belzec guard who was called to witness in Munich and who then himself became the target of a criminal investigation, died some months ago. Alex Nagorny, another witness, is now under investigation for participation in alleged mass murders at Treblinka, according to a notice from the Associated Press on 19 February. However, considering that Nagorny is 94 years old, it does not seem very likely that he will live to stand trial.

Recently Demjanjuk's defence attorney, Ulrich Busch, stated that he had gained access to new evidence contradicting the late key witness Ignat Danilchenko's statements from 1949 and 1979 to the effect that Demjanjuk had participated in mass killings of Jews at Sobibór. Demjanjuk's son in turn commented on this recent development saying: "This case has been fraught with government coverup, prosecutorial misconduct and fraud over the years and this is but another chapter of the same" (Canadian Press, 8 February 2011).

People who have spent considerable time observing the proceedings in Munich first-hand have informed me that during all of the sessions to date, the issue of the technical evidence for the 27,900 cases of murder that Demjanjuk allegedly assisted through his alleged presence as a guard at the Sobibór camp has not been mentioned.

Despite the misconduct with regard to the investigation of the alleged presence of Demjanjuk at Sobibór, a scandal vastly greater is the fact that the alleged murders in question have never been proven to have taken place with hard evidence. People who have spent considerable time observing the proceedings in Munich first-hand have informed me that during all of the sessions to date, the issue of the technical evidence for the 27,900 cases of murder that Demjanjuk allegedly assisted through his alleged presence as a guard at the Sobibór camp has not been mentioned. This should of course not surprise us, as the situation has been the same in countless previous German war-crime trials. The existence of the gas chambers and the mass murders allegedly carried out using these legendary contraptions has simply been considered an *a priori* fact and taken judicial notice of.

As for Sobibór, the existence of the alleged gas chambers in that camp was debated neither at the 1966 Sobibór trial in Hagen, nor at the two trials against members of the camp personnel in 1950 (even though at that time the accused, Hubert Gomerski, stated that only some 25-30,000 deaths occured at Sobibór). That the new Demjanjuk trial—where, *nota bene*, the foremost expert on the camp, Jules Schelvis, has appeared as a joint plaintiff—has been conducted so far with complete disregard of the archeological evidence uncovered by Professor Kola as well as other important exonerating evidence (I am thinking here especially of the diary entries of the Vilna Jew, Herman Kruk, which confirm that transports of Dutch Jews were arriving in Lithuania at the same time as the alleged mass gassings of Dutch Jews at Sobibór which Demjanjuk supposedly assisted in) clearly demonstrates that we are here dealing with a show trial, and that the official Sobibór story can only be maintained by the obfuscation and banishment of facts.

"The very existence of [Holocaust denial] statutes could very well add credibility to the claims of the deniers. Precisely because they cannot be refuted, the deniers will claim, must their ideas be ruled outside the pale of legitimate discussion." *J. Rosenblum, Jerusalem Post Magazine*

Statement of Ukrainian-born John Demjanjuk in Germany

Demjanjuk is standing trial on 28,060 counts of accessory to murder on allegations that he agreed to serve the Nazis in the Sobibor death camp after being captured.

As a child, Stalin condemned me to die through Holodomor, the forced famine. As a Soviet Ukrainian POW of the Germans, they tried to kill me through starvation and slave labor. The USA and Israel fraudulently accused me of being Ivan the Terrible. As a result, I spent 8.5 years in prison and 5 years in the death cell. Though innocent, on each of those 1,800 days in a death cell, I feared I was going to die due to the reckless fraud and political motives of corrupt prosecutors and judges who were not seeking justice.

John Demjanjuk
1992 in Israeli court

Now, nearing the end of my life, Germany, the nation which murdered with merciless cruelty millions of innocent people, attempts to extinguish my dignity, my soul, my spirit, and indeed my life with a political show trial seeking to blame me, a Ukrainian peasant, for the crimes committed by Germans in World War II. They chose me for prosecution—a foreign POW in the brutal hands of Germany rather than any of the truly guilty Germans and Ethnic Germans. Germany's weapons of torture in this trial include suppression of exculpatory evidence, falsification of history, introduction of so-called legal principles which never existed in Germany previously, conspiring with fraudulent prosecutors of the USA and Israel, and a reckless refusal of each argument, motion and exculpatory piece of evidence my defense has submitted which should have already resulted in my acquittal and freedom.

Fearing the truth, the German Court and Prosecutors continue to turn a blind eye to justice by refusing the following:

To request from Russia and Ukraine, File 1627, the 1400-page Soviet MGB/KGB investigative file on my case.

1. To request from Russia and Ukraine, File 15457, the investigative file of Ignat Danilchenko, specifically to include the report of interview conducted with him about me at the request of the US authorities in 1983/1984.
2. To request a qualified expert to examine the high-quality photos available of the signature on the 1393 Trawniki document which has been falsely attributed to me.
3. To accept as historical fact that the Nazis tortured Ukrainian POWs like me with starvation so that 3.5 million were murdered.
4. To accept as historical fact, based upon overwhelming evidence from multiple countries and dozens of witnesses, that POW Trawnikis were coerced under a real threat of death and were executed for attempting desertion.
5. To accept as historical fact, based upon the entire record of the US and Israel proceedings, that I have previously been indicted and tried for the crimes now alleged here which resulted in my acquittal and release from Israel.

John Demjanjuk
2010 in a German court.
(AP Photo/Lukas Barth, pool)

I have survived the brutality of Stalin and Nazi Germany and the wrongful conviction and death sentence of the Israelis and Americans. I have lived through unimaginable horrors from Stalin and death by starvation, to Nazi Germany and death by starvation and cannibalism as a POW, to Israel and death by hanging. This trial is now nothing more than the execution of these three unjust and horrific death sentences.

There remains no other way for me to show the world what a mockery of justice this trial represents. Unless the Court accepts the historical facts, uses its authority to obtain the critical defense evidence not yet before the court, and shows the world that it fully accepts its duty to seek justice rather than just conduct a political show trial, I will within 2 weeks begin a hunger strike.

John Demjanjuk

Following are comments by Demjanjuk's son, John Demjanjuk Jr.:

If the Germans are interested in justice, they will simply ask the Russians and the US to turn over all the evidence including Soviet Investigative file 1627 on my father and the missing Danilchenko reports. They have access to the evidence and we do not. This case has been fraught with government cover-up and prosecutorial misconduct and fraud over the years. So far, this trial has been just another chapter of the same injustice.

Testimonies and official Nazi war records prove Soviet POWs faced starvation by the millions or were coerced to serve or face execution for desertion. It is abhorrent for Germany to now make its former prisoners and victims responsible for the crimes committed by Germans who in many cases were acquitted or never tried by Germany. This is not about justice being better late than never. Rather, it is Germany's continued utter failure to accept responsibility for destroying the millions of people it captured.

John Demjanjuk Jr.

From Lady Gaga to Saigon and Back Again. Continued from page 2

Holocaust question. It's been the primary fragment of my life.

But I am troubled by the fact that in some very deep way I am so dangerously disinterested in the money—until I need some to invest in the work, to pay the bills. Just like that afternoon on the road leading out of the Tan Son Nhat airport to Saigon with $6 in the pocket. I feel fine. I'm here. I have my computer and access to the internet. I'm where I want to be. It is not the work fragment, not the health fragment of the life that makes me anxious. It's the money fragment.

So—any and all suggestions about money are welcome. Considering the immaturity of my character on this issue—I know, that's a straight line—it would be best to make your suggestions of a practical nature.

Thank you.

JHATE – A BLOG ABOUT ANTI-SEMITISM

Turns out I'm being monitored by Jhate [Jew-Hate], a blog dedicated to the idea that in our culture free expression should be an exception, not the rule.

When I followed up on the alert I found an entry titled "A Touching Post by Alex Linder." The title referred to a note he had copied from my Face Book page originally addressed to me.

It read:

"From Alex Linder.

"Bradley, just an anecdote re your ad campaigns. Back in the '80s, you tried to place a holo-questioning ad in 'Student Life' at Pomona College in Claremont, California. Our editor in chief, a jewess named Kopec, refused to run it. I'm embarrassed to admit (I was an opinions editor) that at that time I had no problem with her decision, as it seemed to me that you were merely being an ass----. It had literally never occurred to me that someone could lie about something as big and known as 'the' 'Holocaust,' and I am by no means an unskeptical person. Of course, this was the age before the internet, but this was a perfect example of what is meant by a Big Lie. Well,

you deserve a lot of credit for what you've done, and now I know the truth you were trying so hard to get out there, so thanks for all your efforts, they have had an effect, even if it sometimes takes years."

I had thought it an interesting anecdote from the past.

I replied: "Alex: Thanks for the story."

Following Linder's letter, Tuchman noted:

"Where I come from, we would say that Bradley Smith is *shepping nachas*."

I had to look it up. To "shep nachas" means to derive pleasure from something. I was "deriving pleasure" from Alex Linder's note. Okay. So what's the story?

Tuchman explained. "Anyone interested in Alex Linder, a neo-Nazi who runs one of the most popular white supremacist websites on the Internet . . . . "

Oh. *That* Alex Linder! I don't know Linder but we have met, once that I remember. At the IHR Holocaust Conference in Sacramento in 2004. We had a chat between a couple of the talks. I was unclear about exactly who he was or exactly what he did but he was a bright guy with a good sense of humor. He showed me a business card that read on one side: "No Jews, Just Right."

After being reminded by Tuchman who Linder is I checked out Linder's site, Vanguard News Network VNN addresses many of the most vital issues facing American culture, in fact Western culture, today. VNN addresses those issues oftentimes from a point of view that is taboo in the old American media. At the same time Linder encourages the use of a vocabulary that I do not like, will not use, and do not want to be associated with. That's just me.

Now that I knew who Linder is, I tried to find out who Aryeh Tuchman is. He says of himself that he is a:

"Research Director with expertise in policy analysis and information management. Extensive knowledge of historical and contemporary anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism and Jewish studies. Impeccable research standards. Manager of institutional knowledge/archives and designer of digitization and information management systems. Interested in research, policy work, advocacy and public education on anti-Semitism, Jewish studies and rabbinics."

Aryeh Tuchman

Other than the above, Aryeh Tuchman is a shadowy presence on the Internet. One image, no family, no friends. All I can find is that he is Assistant Director, Civil Rights Division; Director, Library and Research Center at Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—HELLO!

And that he is the primary author of *Fighting Holocaust Denial in Campus Newspaper Advertisements: A Manual for Action,* which was published by an ADL/Hillel consortium specifically to stifle CODOH and free expression on the American campus. And that he is—good g-d—a rabbi (I think).

Makes me wonder though. Why would a man with such elevated professional capacities be interested in someone like me? I have no expertise in policy analysis or information management. Very little knowledge of (or interest in) historical and contemporary anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism or Jewish studies. I do no academic or scientific research. I am unfamiliar with institutional knowledge/archives and am incapable of designing digitization and information management systems. And then I have no interest whatever in advocacy of public education on anti-Semitism, Jewish studies or rabbinics.

Makes me wonder. But not for long. It's not that complicated. You can be all the things that Rabbi Aryeh Tuchman is and still not be able to handle very simple, everyday questions.

Can you provide, with proof, the name of one person killed in a gas chamber at Auschwitz?

Or Belzec? Or Triblinka? Or Maidanek? Or. . . .?

Rabbi Tuchman is kinda out there all alone with his little blog. He appears to be caught in a trap where he fears that a real dialogue with a revisionist could turn into a catastrophe for him. He will choose to "disappear" revisionist questions and those who ask them rather than participate in a free exchange of ideas. He has no feeling for the idea that the solution for liberating ourselves is to begin to talk.

Israeli-born Gilad Atzmon notes: "Our academics are suppressed, and scholarship is silenced, for within the tyranny of political correctness, our academics

are forced to primarily consider the *boundaries* of the discourse—they first examine carefully what they are *allowed* to say—and then they fill in the empty spaces, formulating theories or narratives [within those boundaries]."

When I look at the photo of Rabbi Tuchman I see a young man who looks to be an agreeable fellow, one I would almost certainly like if we were to meet some afternoon at the neighborhood bar—or better, let's say a Starbucks. And then I remember that Rabbi Tuchman sees revisionism as a problem that must be solved. What's the solution? The solution is condemnation, censorship, taboo, imprisonment, and ruin for those of us who do not believe what he believes.

Maybe it's time for the rabbis of every faith to worry less about problems and worry more about the solutions used to solve such problems. The State is always solution oriented. The intellectual class is solution oriented. It is those two classes, along with those who serve them, who have given us the great solutions throughout history. Over the last century alone we have had such problem-solvers as Lenin, the Kaiser, Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Churchill, Roosevelt, Truman, Mao and so on giving us one grand solution after another. In every case it can be argued that their solutions were worse than the problems they were dedicated to solve.

Nowadays the State and its intellectuals are going to feel called upon to invent solutions to the problems of Egypt, Libya, Oman, Ethiopia, Tunisia, Syria, Iran—and oh yes, Israel. These places today are the results of the solutions used to create them in the first place. May the fates spare us what may well come out of the new solutions that are going to be proffered by those folk who provided the last ones.

The Rabbi Tuchmans are committed to the slogan "Never Forget." To never forget is to create a problem that will never end. Assuming that life will go on, we can be assured that the problem of ending all real examination of the Holocaust question will evolve endlessly so that those who are dedicated to solving it will have the opportunity to create an unending number of new solutions. I would urge the Rabbi Tuchmans to forget it, and turn their attention, and their hearts, to finding a way to talk to us.

WHEN DIALOGUE BECOMES A CATASTROPHE

Bradley Smith for YouTube

Here are the notes for a second YouTube video we uploaded to the Internet on 18 February.

The first week in February I received a nice email letter from Dr. Ruth Samuel Tenenholtz, Haifa, Israel. She wrote:

"I want to wish you an interesting life in interesting times.

"I hope you get to emigrate the way the Jews did in Europe—fifty or a hundred to a cattle car. No toilet. No place to sit. No water no food. They arrived covered in their own waste. Many dead, still standing. Because there was no room to fall.

"People like you should be run over by slow moving trucks with spikes. People like you should slowly choke on a fish bone.

"I wish you all of that. Perhaps you should first watch your children be murdered by having their skulls cracked against a wall, swung by their feet, while soldiers hold you back at gunpoint. Then, your wife. She is stripped and shot. But she is not dead. Nevertheless, she is buried inside a lime pit.

"You are sent to a labor camp to carry stones up a hill and then down again. day in and day out. Your diet is three hundred calories a day, and you stand at attention every day until all the inmates are counted. That might take several hours. In the end, exhausted, suffering from dysentery, you are 'se-

lected' to die. You are given a slice of bread extra. You eat it.

"The next day you are marched to the gas chambers, told to strip, and with hundreds of others, perhaps so crowded in that you must raise your hands above your head to make room for a few more emaciated bodies, you are shoved inside. The doors are closed and the gas comes in through the vents. It takes you almost 20 minutes to day[sic]. During that time, your entire life flashes before your eyes, and you realize that nothing is left of your family. All gone. As is your fortune.

"As all this happened to millions of people, I suppose they were killed because someone hated them enough to want them gone. I, at least, have a good reason to wish this on you. You, on the other hand, have no reason to deny that it happened – except stupid, unfounded hatred.

"The Jews are less than 1% of world population. In fact, they are a mere 14 million out of the nearly 7 billion people in this world. You have to meet 50.000 people before you meet a Jew.

"How many have you ever met? Shame on you and your organization. You are indeed a threat to the world. To decency. To all of mankind.

"With contempt,

Dr. Ruth Samuel Tenenholtz, Haifa, Israel"

Oddly—but but maybe not all that oddly—the vocabulary of Dr. Ruth Tenenholtz, Haifa, Israel, causes the brain to reflect on the vocabulary of UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova, Bulgaria. The two ladies share a certain worldview, a certain psychology, a certain conformity. Neither can bring herself to participate in a real exchange of ideas. When you are certain you know what truth is, a real dialogue can create a catastrophe for you.

Last month when the Egyptian uprising burst into the news it was clear from the very first that the director-general of UNESCO was on the side of freedom of expression for the protestors. She said so from the get-go.

Irina Bokova

She said: "I call on all in Egypt to respect the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of information as laid down in Article 19 in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights … Article 19 states that 'Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless frontiers.' … reports have been received about the shutdown of most internet traffic and mobile networks. This is totally unacceptable."

She said: "Silencing the media or attempting to intimidate them is an unacceptable assault on the right of citizens to be informed."

On 11 February UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova condemned the murder of Egyptian journalist Ahmed Mohammed Mahmoud. He was shot in the head on 29 January while covering the protests in Cairo and died on 06 February.

The Secretary-General stated: "Violence against journalists represents an attack on the basic right of freedom of expression and therefore a direct threat to democracy. Media professionals must be able to work in safety in order to nurture free and independent debate."

Well I agree. I agree. But the brain was momentarily sidetracked by the story of Ahmed Mohammed Mahmoud being shot in the head. A fragment of my own life was the distracting element. I wanted to tell the story about the time when I was shot in the head myself. It was in Korea, a Chinese machine gunner found me. That was a long time ago, it was a light hit, but it left a real impression on me. I've told parts of the story before but not the whole story. It's dramatic, but it's funny too. I still laugh when I tell it.

But taking a moment to reflect on the murder of Ahmed Mohammed Mahmoud, I realize I would be using a real human tragedy of one real family, one real man, to talk about myself. It was the wrong time, the wrong moment. It would be a vulgarity on my part to exploit the story of Ahmed Mohammed Mahmoud to tell a story about myself that took place—what?—sixty years ago? No. I'm going to allow that fragment of my life to wait for another time. Reminds me, however, that tomorrow I'll be eighty-one years old. How did that happen?

Well, back to Irina Bokova.

At the same time that Ms. Bokova is using her office to call for free expression for young Egyptian protestors, she leads top United Nations officials to Auschwitz-Birkenau to help combat denial of the Holocaust.

"The aim of this highly symbolic visit is to convey a unanimous, intercultural and interfaith message to combat Holocaust denial and all forms of racism."

Bokova says: "We must counter anyone, anywhere, who seeks to deny the Holocaust or diminish its significance."

What does Ms. Bokova mean by "to counter"? Is she thinking along the line of Dr. Ruth's suggestions of using trucks with nails in their wheels to kill us? Or fish bones thrust down our throats to kill us? I don't think so. The Director-General is only thinking of destroying our books, destroying our websites, imprisoning us, which is the way it is done in France where UNESCO is headquartered. Where Director-General Bokova works and walks the streets.

These two ladies share a worldview, a psychology, a devotion to commonplace belief. Accumulatively it appears to include a careless, unthinking, rather innocent anti-German racism. How will the Secretary-General handle the issue of free expression for those young Egyptian revolutionaries who will certainly begin to speak out about Holocaust fraud and falsehood?

Egyptian journalists, as do Muslims everywhere, understand that the Jewish Holocaust story is used to morally justify American/Israeli policies in Palestine and throughout the Muslim world. There are Egyptian journalists who understand that the Holocaust story needs to be questioned, needs to be challenged, needs to be discussed in an open debate with a right to free expression.

I am going to guess that the director-general of UNESCO does not believe in free expression for those Egyptian journalists who do not agree with her and with Dr. Ruth about the sacred, unquestionable, Jewish holocaust story.

I wonder. Would she feel the need to wrestle with her conscience if she were to discover that Ahmed Mohammed Mahmoud himself doubted the Holocaust story? That some of his colleagues are doubters as well—or even deniers?

Rabbi Tuchman again.

Yesterday, 28 February, I posted on my blog the lead-in to a story from *Haaretz*, the Israeli daily, about Israeli Rabbi Dov Lior and his refusal to be interrogated over his support for *The King's Torah* and the "laws" for killing Gentiles. I wondered what Rabbi Tuchman thought about this book.

Today on his own blog Rabbi Aryeh Tuchman noted he was "finally" able to get hold of *The King's Torah (w*hich was published in 2009) and had passed an hour reading through it. He wrote:

"I have never been so repulsed, disgusted and angered by a book — and that's saying a lot, given how much anti-Semitic stuff I read.

"*The King's Torah* is itself precisely the obscene caricature of Judaism that one finds in the allegations of anti-Semites. In the US this book would be protected by the First Amendment, but in Israel there are laws against this type of thing, and I support the prosecution of the authors and promoters of *Torat HaMelech* [the Hebrew title] to the full extent that those laws allow. It is important that we who expose and fight against anti-Semitism be willing to denounce extremism and bigotry in our own communities as well. There is no excuse for it."

I am pleased to assume that by paying a little attention to Rabbi Tuchman on my blog that I have helped him say what he has needed, perhaps, to say for some time. He has gotten it off his chest. A first step. I have it in mind to give him a number of other opportunities to speak out about extremism and bigotry in the Jewish community.

Mazel tov?

Bradley

Smith's Report
is published by

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust

Bradley R. Smith, Founder

For your contribution of $39 you will receive 12 issues of *Smith's Report.*

Canada and Mexico--$45

Overseas--$49

Letters and Donations to:

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143

Desk: 209 682 5327

Email:

bradley1930@yahoo.com